

agriculture and business right here at home in the United States. Overall, it just makes good sense.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, after long and difficult deliberation, I have decided to vote for permanent normal trade relations with China. The House of Representatives has now passed the bill and I expect the Senate to take it up next month, after the Memorial Day recess.

California is the leading state in world trade. Its location on the Pacific Rim makes our relationship with Asia extremely important.

During my congressional career, I have supported some of the trade relations proposals we have considered and opposed others. I believe that each trade proposal should be considered on its own, and I do not have an ideological bent on the issue of trade.

The decision on this bill—to grant permanent normal trade relations status to China—has been one of the hardest I have ever had to make, because the arguments on both sides have merit. I would like to review in this statement the excellent points made by both sides in the debate.

First, with respect to human rights, those opposed to PNTR cite China's continuing terrible human rights record. They argue that by not having annual review of China's trade status, we will lose our strongest leverage to force China to change its behavior. It is also argued that by granting China permanent normal trade relations, we are rewarding and legitimizing the leaders who have such a bad human rights record. Finally, the argument that increased contact with China will improve human rights conditions is undermined by the facts. According to the 1999 State Department Human Rights Report, the Chinese government's human rights record has deteriorated over the past several years, despite increased contacts between China and the United States.

But there are human rights advocates who support PNTR for China. They believe that isolating China will be bad for human rights, because the leaders will then be under no outside pressure to change their behavior. They also argue that, over time, people to people contacts through the media, internet and travel will expose the Chinese people to international standards and values and will continue to gradually loosen rigid, authoritarian structures. This is why such esteemed human rights leaders as the Dalai Lama and Wang Dan, on of the Tiananmen Square leaders, support PNTR for China.

The human rights concerns are why inclusion of the Levin amendment in the House bill is so important to me. This regime to monitor human rights and worker rights in China will put these issues in sharp focus and will sig-

nificantly increase our knowledge about whether the Chinese people are making progress in these areas. I commend Congressman LEVIN for his leadership in attaching this important safeguard to the legislation.

Second, with respect to the impact of PNTR on American jobs, there are arguments on both sides. Opponents say that bringing China into the World Trade Organization and granting it permanent normal trade status will result in the loss of more than 800,000 jobs in the United States. They believe it will allow multinational corporations to move many operations into China, where worker wages and benefits are much lower, wages being as low as 13 cents an hour.

The principal argument in favor of PNTR is that we must pass it in order to get the benefits of the trade agreement negotiated by the Clinton administration last year, which requires China to lower trade barriers and open up the Chinese market to all kinds of American products and services, including many from my State of California. Supporters estimate that implementation of this agreement will increase exports of U.S. goods to China by more than \$13 billion per year by 2005. Supporters also argue that granting PNTR to China will give the U.S. the ability to force Chinese compliance with all terms of the trade agreement, including with WTO-authorized sanctions if necessary. If PNTR is not granted, the U.S. could not avail itself of WTO enforcement procedures.

So it is clear that there are strong arguments on both sides of the human rights and workforce/labor issues.

But the reason I have decided to vote in favor of permanent normal trade relations status for China is because, first and foremost, I believe that it is my responsibility as a United States Senator to put the national security of the United States above all other considerations. And on the national security question, in my opinion, there is only one rational view.

I believe that through engagement with China we have the best opportunity to avoid a cold war type atmosphere, which hung like a cloud over this nation—indeed, the world—for 45 years after World War II.

A vote against PNTR would suggest that the U.S. views China as an adversary and would make it much more difficult to engage China to work with us constructively in key strategic areas. Of particular concern to me is China's role in efforts to bring peace and stability to the Korean Peninsula. China encouraged North Korea's compliance with the U.S.-DPRK (North Korea) framework which halted the North's nuclear weapons program, and China will undoubtedly have to be part of any solution that integrates North Korea into the international community.

China also plays a key role in the international community's response to

the continuing conflict between India and Pakistan. China has in fact condemned both nations for conducting nuclear tests, and has urged them both to conduct no more tests, to avoid deploying or testing missiles, and to work to resolve their differences over Kashmir through dialogue, rather than military action.

Finally, China is playing an increasingly active and constructive role in Asian security and stability. U.S. isolation of China would seriously undermine our ability to influence China's future orientation, and would set us on a dangerous path of confrontation.

I am under no illusions that granting PNTR to China will make it our new best friend. But failure to do so could well make it an adversary of the sort that we lived with for almost half a century until the fall of the Berlin Wall and the disintegration of the Soviet Union. That is a risk we should not take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

#### THE RUNOFF ELECTION IN PERU

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, it is fortuitous that the Senator from Ohio would make his remarks before mine. I share and agree with most of what he has said with regard to trade.

I rise on a point that could be a troubling cloud that, even if the next President and even if the next Congress were to take the suggestions of the Senator from Ohio, and if certain events that are unfolding this very minute were to take a wrong turn, could dramatically and negatively affect these trade opportunities.

The Andean region—Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, Panama, and Venezuela—is experiencing difficult times. I rise specifically today about events that are under advisement this minute in Peru.

As those who follow events there know, very aggressive behavior by President Fujimori led to a constitutional override of a two-term limitation on his Presidency, and he is seeking a third term. The elections on April 9 were viewed as flawed by the international community. Severe questions occurred as to whether or not a fair election had occurred. The OAS, the Carter Center, NDI, and other international observers have argued that the runoff election which will occur this Sunday, unless postponed, is in severe doubt and question. The Organization of American States, along with others, has said that the computer system—which is crucial to the vote count and crucial to monitoring the election—is not in a condition for which a fair election can occur and as a result they would not be able to accredit the election. If an election occurs this Sunday, for which all national and international interests have said you cannot

appropriately observe the election, you can't tell whether it has been fair or not, if the government proceeds with that, it will be a serious blow to the democratic countries that the Senator from Ohio alluded to and to constitutional law and to the growth of democracy in our hemisphere.

Very recently, Senator LEAHY from Vermont and I authored a joint resolution on this matter which reads: Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled that it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should promptly convey to the President of Peru, if the April 9, 2000, elections are deemed by the international community not to have been free and fair, the United States will review and modify as appropriate its political and economic and military relations with Peru and will work with other democracies in the hemisphere and elsewhere towards restoration of democracy in Peru. This is passed by the House. This is passed by the Senate. This is signed by the President of the United States and, therefore, this is the policy of the United States with regard to these elections.

The situation has not improved. As I said, we have a computer system that is flawed. We have the opposition candidate who has withdrawn from the election. We have the Organization of American States saying we will withdraw all observers. We are hours away from a very serious turnback and reversal in our hemisphere in the country of Peru. Constitutional law, the hemisphere of new democracies, will have suffered a blow.

Supposedly, in the next 2 or 3 hours, their electoral commission will make a statement as to whether they will listen to the world, listen to the OAS, listen to the United States Congress, the President of the United States, and delay these elections or not.

I rise only for the purpose of saying that it will be an acknowledged blemish on so much progress that had been made in this last decade. It will have dire and long-reaching consequences if the Government of Peru does not hear a world talking to it.

I can only pray that in the next hour or two, the government will recognize that it must have an environment under which elections will be fair and observers will have the ability to adjudicate this was a fair election or this was not. To my colleagues, I say, there are events unfolding in this hemisphere to which we must pay far more attention. As the Senator from Ohio said, the vast majority of our trade now is in this hemisphere. It exceeds Europe and it exceeds the Pacific. It had better be a healthy place because it means a great deal to us and our fellow citizens.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

#### MEASURE READ FOR THE FIRST TIME—S. 2645

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill, the China Non-proliferation Act, which I now send to the desk on behalf of myself and Senator TORRICELLI, as well as the following original cosponsors: Senators COLLINS, DEWINE, INHOFE, KYL, SANTORUM, and SPECTER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for the first time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2645) to provide for the application of certain measures to the People's Republic of China in response to the illegal sale, transfer, or misuse of certain controlled goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMPSON. I now ask for the bill's second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be held at the desk.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Tennessee for my objection. I was engaged in a discussion and did not hear what he was asking for. I understand it had been worked out and was ready to go. We were not clear on exactly what was happening.

The Senator from Tennessee wishes to reclaim the floor, and I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON. I didn't hear the majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. I was explaining why I objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I ask for the bill's second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will remain at the desk.

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield the floor.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1291, H.R. 3591, H.R. 4051, AND H.R. 4251

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I understand there are four bills at the desk due for their second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1291) to prohibit the imposition of access charges on Internet service providers, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 3591) to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in recognition of their service to the Nation.

A bill (H.R. 4051) to establish a grant program that provides incentives for States to enact mandatory minimum sentences for certain firearm offenses, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 4251) to amend the North Korea Threat Reduction Act of 1999 to enhance Congressional oversight of nuclear transfers to North Korea, and for other purposes.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings on these bills at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be placed on the calendar.

#### PROVIDING FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the adjournment resolution just received from the House, that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 336) was agreed to, as follows:

#### H. CON. RES. 336

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, May 25, 2000, or Friday, May 26, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 6, 2000, for morning-hour debate, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, May 25, 2000, Friday, May 26, 2000, Saturday, May 27, 2000, or Sunday, May 28, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, June 5, 2000, or Tuesday, June 6, 2000, as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or at such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.*

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.